

COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 43.—No. 12.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 21, 1822. [Price 6d.

Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.

TO

SIR THOMAS BARING.

On the Resolution, relative to Labourers' Wages, issued by him, by two "Squires," and by five Parsons, from the Grand Jury Chamber at Winchester, on the 31st August 1822

Kensington, 17 Sept. 1822.

BARING,

I HAVE before me the order, or rather, manifesto, put forth by you, by other two men called 'Squires, and by five parsons, at Winchester, and dated on the 31st of last month. Before I proceed to remark upon this document, which will certainly become a very remarkable and memorable thing, I will insert it that the public may see what it is; but, before I do that, let me observe, that I see

clearly the state in which the thing is; that I see, that, unless rents can be got out of deductions from labour, there can be no rents; that I see, that, if there be no rents, there cannot long be any tithes; and that I see, that both of these must go, and that the fundholders' interests must go, unless, which I know to be impossible, the means of paying rent and tithes can be made to come out of deductions from the wages of labour.

This publication of yours is certainly something perfectly new. I am not aware of any law that calls upon magistrates to put forth such publications. I am not aware of any law that authorizes magistrates, in this their public capacity and sitting upon their bench, to put forth even recommendations relative to the wages which la-

Z

bourers are to receive. This is a declaration put forth by you and the other magistrates present. It is a species of manifesto, being a public protestation on the subject of the wages of labour. However, let us see it first, and then make our remarks upon it.

New Regulation of Allowance to the Poor.

At a Meeting of the Magistrates acting in and for the Division of Fawley, in the county of Southampton, at their Petty Sessions, held at the Grand Jury Chamber, Winchester, the 31st day of August 1822:

Present — The Rev. Edmund Poulter (Chairman), the Hon. and Rev. Augustus George Legge, Sir Thomas Baring, Bart. the Rev. William Hill Newbolt, D. D. William Nevill and Geo. Lovell, Esqrs. the Rev. F. W. Swanton, and the Rev. Robert Wright, eight of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace;

And a large and respectable number of the Yeomanry residing within the division, who were requested by the Magistrates to attend on this occasion.

The Magistrates having taken into their consideration the allowances usually made by this Bench to Paupers applying for relief, and the diminished price of every article of life, resolved unanimously,

That in future the Magistrates, acting at this Bench, in making their orders, either collectively or individually, for the maintenance and relief of such Paupers, will

not exceed the following allowances:

When the family shall consist of a man and his wife, with one or two children; or a man with two or three children; or a woman with two or three children—To each of them the price of a gallon loaf, of the best wheaten bread, and 4d. each over per week.

When the family shall consist of a man and his wife, with three or four children; or a man with four or five children; or a woman with four or five children—To each of them the price of a gallon loaf, of the best wheaten bread, and 3d. each over per week.

When the family shall consist of a man and his wife, with five or more children; or a man with six or more children; or a woman with six or more children—To each of them the price of a gallon loaf, of the best wheaten bread, and 2d. each over per week.

And whereas a practice has been prevalent amongst the labouring classes to absent themselves during a part of the year when their services are most required, and to return after the harvest, and become a burthen to their respective parishes, the Justices recommend to the officers of every parish, when the family shall consist of a man and his wife, or a man with one child, to offer to each such man, 4s. per week from Michaelmas to Lady Day, and 5s. per week from Lady Day to Michaelmas, so that he might be engaged to serve the whole year; and any man refusing that offer shall not be entitled to any relief. If no such offer be made, or no sufficient employment can be found whereby any such man can maintain himself and his wife or child, the allowance is to be 3s. 6d. per week, and no more.

To every unmarried man, the Justices recommend the officers of

every parish to offer 3s. per week from Michaelmas to Lady Day, and 4s. per week from Lady Day to Michaelmas, so that he may be engaged to serve the whole year; and any unmarried man refusing that offer shall not be entitled to any relief. If no such offer be made, or no sufficient employment can be found, whereby any such unmarried man can maintain himself, he shall be allowed 2s. 6d. per week, and no more.

To a woman with one child, 3s. 6d. per week, and no more.

To every single woman, the sum of 2s. 6d. per week, and no more.

And the Justices do declare, That all paupers maintained and relieved by their parishes, and able to work, shall, for the allowances so to be made to them, be compelled to perform such proper work as the parish officers shall direct or require of them; and it is earnestly recommended to the parish officers to provide as far as possible employment for all such paupers, and if they neglect or refuse to perform the work found for them, they will be punished as the law directs.

Ordered that the foregoing resolutions be inserted in the Hampshire County Newspaper.

T. WOODHAM,
Clerk to the Magistrates.

—

This is a document of very great importance to the country. The persons who have authorized the publication of it must, doubtless, be persons of singular merit, seeing the posts which they fill, and the large incomes that the most of them derive from those posts.

WILLIAM NEVILL and GEORGE LOVELL, who are simply "Esquires," the world does not know so much about, how well soever they may be known in Hampshire. The rest are persons of great weight to this community; I mean yourself and the five parsons, whom I shall take one by one.

You are the owner of an immense estate, which was the Duke of Bedford's. Your Father was, not a great many years ago, a trader in the city of London under the name of FRANCIS BARING, who became a great maker of loans to the Government. Your brother ALEXANDER has the estate near you, which belonged to Lord NORTHINGTON; and some of your family have lately bought the immense estate that was Lord PETRE's in Suffolk. Of the connexion with BINGHAM of Philadelphia I shall not speak at present, though that family was great in its way, too. You have two brothers in the House of Commons, besides yourself; you being

one of the Members for the Borough of High Wycombe. Your pedigree, as I find it in the Baronetage, traces you back all the way up to a Dutch descent; but what is greater than all these claims to distinction, I find your name enrolled in the Bible Society, in that for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge; and, to crown the whole, in the Loyal Bridge Street Association for opposing the progress of disloyal and seditious principles, where I find you down for a subscription of ten pounds ten shillings; which you will observe is rather more than *one year's wages*, allowed by this manifesto to a labouring man; those wages being no more than nine pounds two shillings.

The Rev. EDMUND POULTER, who was the Chairman upon this occasion, is a Prebendary of Winchester, and is Rector of the parishes of Meon Stoke and Sober-ton. He has one son who is Rector of Buriton and Petersfield and also Rector of Burstow. Another son he has who is Vicar

of Alton, and who has besides, the livings of Holybourn, Binstead and Kingsley. I will just add that this Chairman married a sister of the late Bishop of Winchester's wife.

The Hon. and Rev. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, is, to begin with, Rector of Wonston, next he is Archdeacon of Winchester, and next he is a Prebendary of Winchester. He has a brother who is Bishop of Oxford; another brother a Commissioner of the Navy; another an Admiral; and his nephew is the Earl of Dartmouth.

The Rev. WILLIAM HILL NEWBOLT is a Canon of Winchester, is Rector of Morestead, Rector of Mottiston and Shorwell, Vicar of Collingbourn and Vicar of Kingston.

The Rev. F. W. SWANTON has the Living of Hillington in Norfolk.

The Rev. ROBERT WRIGHT is Rector of Ilchen Abbots and Rector of Ovington.

Thus these *five* Reverend par-

sons have, amongst them, one Archdeaconry, two Prebends, one Canonship, four Rectories, two Vicarages, and three other Livings; besides what things are in possession of their relations. This is all that I get at from the books that I have in my possession. Persons possessed of better sources of information would, doubtless, be able to discover still further reasons for supposing, that these must be men of great and rare merit.

Having now brought my readers acquainted with the parties, from under whose authority this document came forth, I shall now proceed to remark upon the document itself. It has been *published*; and published, too, by order of you and the rest of these magistrates. It is said to contain your unanimous resolution. The only reasons, on which the rates of wages and allowance is founded, is to be found (if it can be called a reason at all), in the following vague words, "The Magistrates having taken into

"their consideration the *diminished price* of every article of *life*."

Diminished price? Diminished means lessened, or lowered; and, certainly, the price is less than it was a few years back, and even less than it was last year. But it is not less than it was in the year 1790; but it is, in fact, a great deal more; for there is the additional duty on malt, salt, soap, candles, leather and a great many other things. It is clear that the labouring man's wages ought, therefore, to be greater now than they were in the year 1790.

Although I have so lately (in my Letter to Mr. Fawkes,) quoted the evidence which Mr. ELLMAN gave before the Agricultural Committee of 1821, I must quote that evidence again here. Mr. Ellman, in the first place, told the Committee: "When I began business as a farmer, *forty-five years ago*, there was not a labouring man in the parish who *did not brew his own beer*, and *enjoy it by his own fire-side*."

"Now, there is *not one of them that does it.*" Here was matter for a Legislative Assembly to reflect on. Here was a proof of the change that had taken place, during those thirty years that our rulers had been bragging of prosperity.

And now let us look at the cause of this melancholy change. For many years previous to the year ninety, wheat had been on an average, at about *four shillings and threepence a bushel*; and Mr. Ellman's evidence tells us, that the common daily wages (exclusive of hay-time and harvest) had been *one shilling and sixpence*; that is to say, *nine shillings a-week*. So that the day-labouring man earned two bushels of best wheat a-week, and rather more. He was not so well off then, as he had been in the time of Mr. Tull; for it appears, from Mr. Tull's book, that the daily pay of the labourer was *one shilling*, when the price of seed-wheat was three shillings a bushel, *nine gallon measure*; so that, the

week's wages then gave eighteen gallons of the best wheat; while the week's wages in 1790 gave only, about sixteen gallons and a half; and, besides, the labouring man of 1790 had to pay on his malt, his salt, his leather, and various other things, more than twice as much tax as the labouring man of Mr. Tull's time had to pay. Accordingly, the poor rates in the year 1790 were two millions and a half in place of being about three quarters of a million as they had been in the time of Mr. Tull.

Great inroads upon the labourer had, therefore, been made by the hellish paper-money, by the ruinous and cruel system of loans and paper-money, even in the year 1790. But, then, the labouring man got nine shillings a-week, or the price of about sixteen gallons and a half of wheat. Since the year 1790, the tax upon malt has been doubled; the tax upon leather has been doubled; the tax upon tea, sugar, soap, has been greatly augmented. There-

fore, the wages of the labouring man ought to be *greater* now than they were in the year 1790. In order to enable him to meet the additional taxation, he ought now to receive about ten shillings a-week, exclusive of hay-time and harvest. Wheat and meat are at about the same price now that they were in 1790; but, as the labourers say, "*every thing else is dear*," and, to be sure, they must be dear while they are all highly taxed, and while taxes have to be paid on all those articles, consumed by the persons who supply the labourers with those things which they significantly call *every thing else*.

What do you mean, then, by the *diminished* price of *every article* of life? There is little or no diminution in the price of any article that they use, except wheat and meat. And you will observe, here, that they do not eat *wheat*: they eat *flour*; and flour does not fall with the price of wheat; because the manufacturers of the flour have to pay the same taxes

when wheat is cheap as they have to pay when it is dear. The diminution that has taken place is only in comparison with the price of *late years*. The comparison that we ought to have in our eye, is that which is afforded by the prices of the year 1790 compared with the present prices. We find then, that the price of meat and of wheat is the same now that it was in the year 1790; but that the price of all other things is greater.

Therefore, as was before noticed, the daily pay of the labourer ought now to be, at least, at the rate of *ten shillings* a-week. And yet, you allot to him *three shillings* a-week for one-half of the year and *four shillings* a-week for the other half of the year; and you decree that if he refuse to labour for such wages, he shall not be entitled to relief! This is to the unmarried man. This is to the man who must buy his bread of a baker. The four shillings a-week will buy him about twenty-eight pounds of bread. But he

is to pay for lodging, for washing and for clothes out of this four shillings a-week. Is it possible for him to do this, under two shillings and sixpence a-week? I ask is it possible for him to do this? Here is nothing for drink. Here is nothing but the bare lodging and washing and clothes. It will take two and sixpence a-week to hide his skin and to prevent him from walking barefooted, and to procure him shelter in the night in the most miserable hovel in England.

He has left, then, *eighteen-pence to provide him with eatables*; and these eighteen-pence will not buy him a *pound and a half of bread a-day*, which is the gaol allowance to felons: and upon this he is to subsist **WHILE HE IS REAPING AND MOWING!** Good God Almighty! That God who says that even the ox shall not be muzzled as he treads out the corn! And, while you are issuing this declaration, Mr. CANNING is telling his hearers at Liverpool, that

the "markets are glutted, that the people are feeding in comfort and affluence; that the labourers have steady employment; that their wages are *something* reduced, certainly, but that still they have *more than sufficient* to procure the necessities of life." You have told him what this more than sufficient is; and, lest he should not see it under your own hands, I have sent to him one of the precious newspapers in which your declaration was, by yourselves, ordered to be published.

This very day I have sent him the *Hampshire Chronicle* containing the declaration; and along with it, I have sent him a Norwich newspaper containing an account of farming stock advertised for sale. The letter, which I enclosed to him with these papers may be worth your perusal; and, therefore, I insert it here.

Kensington, 17 Sept. 1822.

SIR,

HAVING read in the newspapers, that you, at a Dinner at Liverpool, spoke of the distress of the landlords and farmers as a thing that

would find a remedy in the *patience* of the suffering parties; and, having read, in the same newspapers, that you, on the same occasion, spoke of the "*comfort and affluence*," now enjoyed by the humbler classes; I take the liberty to enclose you two newspapers, the *Norwich Gazette* of the 14th, and the *Hampshire Chronicle* of the 9th, of this month. The one hundred and six advertisements in the former, for the public sale of farming stock, may enable you to judge whether patience much short of that of Job would be sufficient for the present emergency; and the Resolution, in the latter, of Sir Thomas Baring and others, may serve to give you something like a correct view of that comfort and affluence, which the humbler classes are now to have the happiness to enjoy. One observation on this Resolution I must add: the whole of the wages, which it allots to an *able labourer*, amount to 3s. 6d. a-week, taking the year round; while a *private foot soldier* receives 7s. 7d. a-week, besides clothing, lodging, fire and candle.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient
and most humble Servant,
WM. COBBETT.

I should notice here that this was only one of the advertising papers for Norfolk. In another, called

the *Norwich Mercury*, of the same dates as the former, there are 121 advertisements of farming stock for public sale, the greater part of them not the same advertisements as the former. When I said 106 in the former, I should have said 115. As nearly as I can ascertain, these two papers announce to us the *breaking up*, or the quitting of business of a hundred and seventy-five farmers of that county and closely on its borders. Well; and is it not time, then, you may say, to reduce the wages of the labourer? Oh! no! There is no room for this. The wages are not the things that want reducing. But this is a matter that I have hereafter to discuss.

Mr. CANNING knows well, that he gives to a day-labourer at Brompton just as much for *one* day as you allow for *six* days; and he knows, that, with the exception of *lodging*, every necessary of life is as cheap at Brompton as in any part of Hampshire. You allow just as much to keep a woman and a child for a *week*, as Mrs.

Canning pays to a washerwoman for one day's work, besides finding her plenty of good victuals and drink. *This*, indeed, is "*comfort and affluence*;" or, at least, it is *good living*; it is what ought to be. But Mr. Canning knows, by this time, what sort of "*comfort and affluence*" the labouring classes in Hampshire are enjoying. You allow 4*s.* a-week for the summer months to an able labourer; a man who is to pitch, load, reap and mow. I give a Hampshire lad 4*s.* a-week all the year round, together with *board, washing and lodging*. You allow the able labourer 9*l.* 2*s.* a-year, without lodging, fuel, candle or any thing else. I give maid servants from 10*l.* to 12*l.* besides their keep; and when Mr. Canning reads your manifesto, the wages that he himself pays will occur to him. He has this document, just as it was published by your order, now in his possession; and, if the Parliament were sitting, he would soon have before him a *petition* on the subject.

This he will have whenever the Parliament shall meet.

Let me now ask Mr. CANNING, whether the man is in "*affluence*" who is mowing upon a pound and a half of bread a-day. Mr. CANNING is now a Minister of State; and it may become him to consider what may be; nay, what *must* be the effect of attempting to make the labourer live upon four shillings a-week, which will buy him but eight pots of beer, and which he ought to have at the very least, exclusive of victuals, clothing and lodging.

But, if it be impossible to effect this with regard to the single man, how is the man with a wife and child to live upon five shillings a-week in summer, and four shillings a-week in winter? Low as prices are at this moment it is not sufficient to pay for the grazing in summer, or for the yard keep in winter, of *two lean cattle and a yearling*! The food that the money would purchase, if it were all laid out in food, is not sufficient to prevent a waste of life. Fee-

bleness of body must come from such living, and the death of the body must be the final consequence. This must be the case if all the money were laid out in food. But, is there to be no house rent; are the poor creatures to have no place to cover them in the night; is there to be no clothing; are there to be no utensils; is there to be no bedding; is there to be no fuel! Great God! Look down upon England at this moment! Is this at last to be the lot of the people of England; and while a Bench of Magistrates are declaring, publicly putting forth, actually proclaiming, their *unanimous resolution* that this is to be the lot of the people, we hear a man, who is now a Minister of State, making a speech in public, in which he says, that the "times are come round, the markets are glutted, the people are feeding in comfort and affluence!"

It may be said, that the farmers are ruined; that they cannot now pay their way; that I have just given a proof of their being

upon the eve of being totally broken up; and that, therefore, they are unable to pay higher wages than those that you have fixed on. This opens to us quite another view of the question. If there were *no other* persons to be paid out of the produce of the earth than the labourers, it is clear enough that it would be just for the labourers to take whatever little there was left for them, after the farmer and his family were fed. But this is not the case. Far different, indeed, is the real state of the matter. There is a church that *takes away a tenth part of the whole of the farmer's produce*. Then there is an army in time of peace that takes away, probably, another tenth part. Then there are placemen, pensioners and sinecure people that take away another large part. Then there is the Debt, contracted for the purpose of carrying on the late wars, that takes away another large part.

Now, BARING, does it not appear reasonable that an attempt

should be made to put a stop to, or to diminish, at least, some of *these* takings away? Does it not appear reasonable that this attempt should be made before making such a declaration as that which you have put forth? We have different opinions as to these matters; but as you have thought proper to publish your declaration and recommendation; as you have thought proper to publish your recommendation to the farmers, I will publish my recommendation to them, in the following words:

Gentlemen, Farmers of Hampshire, it appears to me that it is impracticable: I say nothing of justice or injustice; but it appears to me that it is wholly impracticable for you to carry on your affairs without giving to the labourers a sufficiency to enable them to work and to keep them in health. I am aware that you cannot do this, and pay rent and yield tithe, and pay, besides, all the taxes that are now levied directly and indirectly upon you.

To suppose a state of things, in which, for any length of time, rents were to go unpaid, is to suppose a community in a state of dissolution. To suppose a state of things, in which the labourers are to be continually in a state of half starvation, is to suppose constant peril to property and to life. In such a state of things there can be no happiness; because there can be neither security nor peace. The labourer, the suffering, the half-famished, the ragged, the cold, the desperate labourer, will not look after distant causes: he will look to the farmer only. And if he suffer from hunger, the farmer only will he accuse of being the cause of that suffering.

To me it appears, therefore, that you ought to look in another direction for the lightening of your burdens. The labour is one source of outgoings with you; but you should always bear in mind that it is the *cause of all the produce*. You should always bear this in mind. When you look at your crop, be the amount

of it what it may; you should reflect that the labourers have *created it all*; and you should not forget, that that Bible, which has been distributed so profusely, inculcates from the beginning to the end of it, the necessity of giving to him who produces the food, his full share of it. The use of the earth is to give sustenance to the people of the country; but more especially to those who cultivate that earth. Therefore, the last thing for a farmer to grudge is a plentiful living to his labourers. If he find himself pressed. If he find demands upon him greater than the amount of his crop, he ought to look to all other means of retrenchment before he comes to the wages of the labourer; because if the labourer be not sufficiently fed, he will be miserable; if he be miserable he will hate his employer; and though that employer may seem to prosper for a while in spite of the hatred of the labourer, in the end prosperous he will not be: God has said it, and

true it will prove to be to the end of time.

In your present situation, you have many things to look to before you resort to a lowering of the labourers' wages, so as to make him a desperate discontented being. To these other things, therefore, you ought to look. The question is rendered confused by our talking so often about *money payments* instead of talking about *payments in kind*. Let me endeavour to put the matter plainly before you. When you pay money, let it be to whom it may, you do, in fact, give the party a certain portion of your crop. If a man come to you for eight shillings of wages, at a time when wheat is four shillings a bushel, you give him two bushels of your wheat. If the parson commutes for his tithes, you pay him in money; but you do, in fact, give him a part of your crop. When you get ten bushels of malt, you pay to the maltster ten half crowns, which he gives to the tax-gathers; but this is only giving a

part of your crop ; and it would be just the same thing, if you were to deliver to the taxgatherer twenty - five shillings' worth of barley or of any other sort of grain.

Now, then, let us suppose that you distributed your crop to the several parties who have demands upon you in the course of the year, instead of first selling the crop and then distributing it to these parties in the shape of money. Suppose that you kept one part of it for yourself and family to eat, to drink, to buy clothes with and so forth ; that you gave another part to the labourers that raised the crop for you ; another part to the landlord ; another part to the parson ; another to the soldiers ; another to the sailors ; another to the placemen, pensioners and sinecure people ; another to the half-pay people ; another to the young gentlemen in the military academies, who are breeding up to be officers ; another in the way of gifts to the church parsons over and above the tithes ;

another to build fine new streets with, and to beautify the buildings belonging to the Parliament-house ; another to build bridges and make canals and roads in the Highlands of Scotland ; and, at last, a good thumping lot to those that made loans to the Government to carry on the late wars.

Let us suppose the crop all threshed out and ready for distribution. You have not *got enough* for all these parties. They can have no more than there is. They can only have all amongst them. There is less than the whole of them demand. Now, let me ask, if the sacks were there standing before you, and each of the parties had a person there to receive and take away his portion, what would you say, if, there not being enough for all the rest without taking part of the labourers' sacks away ; what would you say if the others were to propose to you, to give them their full demand, by taking half the sacks of the labourers away from them ? Why, you would

think the proposition a most monstrous one, to be sure. You would say, this is the *most necessary portion of all*; for, if I take away the sacks of these poor fellows, *how am I to get another crop?* You would say, how am I to live in peace with these people; they are more necessary to me than any body else. Doubtless parsons and armies and navies and ordnance and freemen of Queenborough and bridges and canals in the Highlands of Scotland and gifts of money to the parsons over and above the tithes and places and pensions and sinecures and money paid for national faith; doubtless, all these are very good and proper things; and I should like to have them well enough; but *I must have the labourers*; I cannot rob their sacks; they must have their share, or I can neither have another crop nor live in safety.

You would then begin to inquire, whether some of the other things might not be done without, or, at any rate, whether a dimi-

nution in the quantity of the crop required for each of them might not take place. You would probably commence your inquiries with the parsons. You would, with me, be ready to agree, I dare say, that it is a very good thing to support religion, but you might be apt to think, that the Rev. Edmund Poulter, for instance, who, being a Prebendary of Winchester, is likely to keep a curate at Meon Stoke; and that (seeing that there is a falling short), it might be well enough for the parish of Meon Stoke to pay tithes to the amount of the curate's wages, and no more. You might think that the Hon. and Rev. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, who is an Archdeacon and a Prebendary, might give up to the parish of Wonston all the tithes, except to the amount of what he pays his curate. The Rev. WILLIAM HILL NEWBOLT, being a Canon of Winchester, might give up all the tithes of Morestead, Mottiston, Shorwell, Collingbourn and Kingston, except enough to pay the curates

that officiate in those places. The Rev. F. W. SWANTON, who resides at Winchester and is a magistrate of Hampshire, might give up all his tithes of Hillington in Norfolk, except enough to pay the Curate who must be there; and who can doubt the willingness of the Rev. ROBERT WRIGHT to give up the tithes of one of his rectories, at least?

This would make a wonderful difference! Let me not be told that this is an irreligious proposition; because, you see, *religion* would have just as much to support it then, as it has now. Mr. NEWBOLT, for instance, cannot, living at Winchester, and attending to his Canonship there, attend also to the five parishes before mentioned. If you were to ask Mr. NEWBOLT how his parishes are attended to; he would answer, *as well as any in the kingdom*. I am not disposed to contradict him; but on the contrary, to agree with him, and to say, that since they are so perfectly well attended to for the small sums which the

Curates receive, those sums are all that are necessary, for the *support of religion* in those parishes. If Mr. NEWBOLT were to rejoin and say; aye, but I want the rest; the question then would come, can you have the rest without starving the labourers?

We might go on thus through the whole list of the parties; and if it came to rates of pay, we might surely ask, whether it were reasonable to take out of the labourers' sack, till he was reduced down to three shillings a-week in winter and four in summer, while there was left in the common foot soldiers' sack enough to give him *seven and sevenpence* a week all the year round? If they talked to us about the wages being in proportion to the price of corn, we should have this observation to make to them: corn in the year 1790 was much about the price that it is now; the soldiers' pay at that time, was *three and sixpence a-week*, it is now *seven and sevenpence*, having in both cases, clothing and lodging, fire and candle.

In the year 1790 the salaries of the Judges (except the Chief's) were *fifteen hundred* pounds a-year each: they are now *three thousand*. We could go on in this way to an enormous extent. We could show how all has been doubled or more than doubled; and that the reduction, whenever it has been made, has been only a *tenth*! Now, if the labourers' wages are to be what the magistrates at Winchester have recommended; if they are to be not so much as one-half what they were in the year 1790, why are not the wages of all persons, which are paid partly out of the sweat of those labourers' brows, to be lowered in the same proportion? Why is a Secretary to the Board of Ordnance to have sixteen hundred and ninety-five pounds a-year now, when he had only five hundred and ten in 1792?

Thus you see, Gentlemen, you would proceed in your enquiry. You would find out that in the year 1790, we had twenty thousand seamen and marines, and

that the navy then cost *less than two millions and a half* a-year; that we have now just the same number of seamen and marines; but that these cost more than *six millions and a quarter* a-year! Having discovered this, you would take some time to consider before you emptied out the labourers' sacks in order to fill up the sacks of the other parties. You would enquire how it could happen that the navy now cost almost three times as much as that of the year 1790; and I think that you would begin to discover, that, in order to have something left for yourselves you must deduct from the other parties and not from the labourers.

I shall come to the Loan Jobbers presently; but, first let me notice the gifts of money to the *Church Parsons*, exclusive of all the tithes and all the rents, of lands and houses, that they receive. Many of you do not know; but it is very fit you all should know, that the Parliament has voted, and you and your labourers have help-

ed to pay, *fourteen or fifteen hundred thousand pounds*, within these last fourteen or fifteen years, "for the relief of the *poor* clergy of the established church!" You will observe that this has come out of the *taxes*; or, rather, out of the *loans*; seeing that the nation was actually borrowing money for a great part of the time, during which this relieving of the poor clergy was going on. I am not quite sure that it is fifteen hundred thousand pounds. It was a hundred thousand pounds a-year, which began about the year 1806, and did not end till last year. So here was a pretty thing! No lack of charity here! Here was relief to be given to *poor* clergy of a church in which one and the same person is an Archdeacon, a Prebendary and a Rector; in which another has two Rectories; in which another is a Canon, has two Rectories and two Vicarages; and so on; and in which church, several Bishops have lately died, leaving behind them fortunes of from one to three hundred thou-

sand pounds! In this whole world, was *charity* like this ever heard of before! Bear in mind that a considerable portion of this sum of money came out of the taxes paid by the labourers.

Now, it is too late to talk about giving this money to the parsons; but, it is by no means too late to *get it back*; and I flatter myself, that we shall yet see the day, when, by means of proper and lawful application, the clergy of this immensely rich Church will be induced, either voluntarily or by law, to pay out of their incomes, back into the National Treasury, a sum equal to that which was given in this manner, and the particulars of which are very clearly stated in the accounts laid before Parliament. If I were a Member of Parliament, not one week should pass over my head before a law to this effect should be proposed. But you can apply for it now; and much more rational it would be than to attempt to screw your labourers down into a state of half starvation.

Another of the parties above mentioned consists of those that are called *fundholders*. These gentry are now receiving three bushels of wheat for every one that they ought to receive. As to this matter, it is so clear, that no one who is not almost an idiot can misunderstand it; and no one but a downright knave, and a barbarous knave, too, will affect to believe, that it is just to crush the labourers down into a state of starvation in order to get the means of triply paying the cormorants of 'Change Alley. The County of Kent has shewn the rest of the nation what they ought to do in this respect. And if the rest of the nation do not follow the example, the whole of the present race of farmers will starve in gaols or die in work-houses.

What, then, is my recommendation to you? To look upon your labourers as the first to be satisfied; for with them you live and must live, and to them you owe your crop, and must owe it, or have no crop. The next per-

son whose claims are to be attended to, is the landlord; but him you cannot pay, with wheat at the price of 1790, and with taxes more than four times as great as those of 1790. Therefore, it is to the *other parties*; to the parsons, to the loan people, to the placemen and pension people, to the army, to the navy, to the precious Ordnance, and to the other branches that you have to look. You will in vain endeavour to get what you want out of the labourers. They are about twenty to one compared with you in number. You cannot kill them. You must have work from them. You may put them in gaol, as the magistrates say they will be put, if they do not perform "*proper work*" for the allowances specified in the foregoing declaration; but you will be pleased to observe that the gaol allowance of bread is greater than that which can be got out of three and sixpence a-week; and that in gaol there is some clothing, and that there is lodging and firing.

But, why do I talk thus to farmers? You know, that with such pay, you could trust no man with your horses, your cattle, your sheep, or in your barns or yards. You know well the desperate disposition which incessant hunger would not fail to create; you know, in short, that for each of you to live amidst a score of labourers hating and detesting you, would make you detest your homes, and flee from them, as you would flee from fire or the plague.

To the other parties, then, you must go. You must make them go off with unfilled sacks. I do not mean that you are to do this by force of arms; but by force of *petition* and *remonstrance*. I recommend nothing that is not lawful. I recommend you to petition, in County Meeting if they will let you; and if they will not, in Hundreds or in Parishes. The plan pursued by Messrs. WICKHAM and TWYNHAM, with regard to the *County Rates*, is a very good one. That petition did not

come before the Parliament, where there would have been opportunity for debate. A petition from you, setting forth the state in which you are, the wages that you have been recommended to give, the reasonableness of the Church paying back the immense sum of money before-mentioned; the reasonableness of lowering the amount of tithes to a sufficiency for paying the officiating ministers; of bringing back the pay of all persons in public employ to the standard of 1790; and, above all things, the justice of reducing the payments to the loan people, in such a manner as to prevent them from receiving three bushels of wheat in place of one; a petition from you, having these objects, and signed by the greater part of you, would not only do you great honour, but would have and must have great effect in procuring you immediate relief.

There is one thing more, which I have to recommend to you; and particularly to you that are *renters*. You have seen how

prices have gone on declining. It would almost seem to be madness ; but the fact is, that there are many farmers, even now, who think that things will *come about*, as they call it. I recommend to you, especially to you who have *wives and families*, to dismiss this delusion from your minds. If they continue to pay in gold ; if the law remain as it now is, **FOR PRICES TO RISE IS IMPOSSIBLE.** I beg you to bear this in mind, and to be certain that complete ruin must fall upon the man who places his hope upon a rise of prices. It is much more likely, that good wheat should fall to *three shillings* a bushel than that it should ever again rise to *seven*. Circumstances may happen, and I think it probable that they will happen, to bring wheat down to three shillings a bushel ; but nothing short of almost a complete failure of crop can again raise it to seven shillings a bushel.

Some men imagine that *war* would raise the price of corn.

War never raised it. It was the paper-money that raised it. The nation cannot again go to war, as long as the Debt lasts at its present amount ; for it must again launch forth on the sea of paper-money, and on that sea the whole would go to rack. Let me conjure you, therefore, you especially who have wives and families, to say, in all your calculations, that wheat has to fall yet further, without the smallest chance of ever being again at a price exceeding that of from three to six shillings a bushel. This being the case, what man who is not mad would take a farm with the present taxes and rates to pay ? Nine-tenths of the farms are worth no rent at all. It is impossible that they should yield rent under the present circumstances, even though the labourers were ground down to half starvation.

It is possible, and barely possible, that the present Parliament may take some efficient measures when they meet. To give you my opinion about that, at this

time, would be to act prematurely; for, I have, as yet, heard nothing of the intentions of any body having the power to act. A great deal will depend upon the conduct of the yeomanry themselves, and, perhaps, those of them who have the greatest influence and the greatest degree of intelligence will be disposed to *cut and run* rather than to give themselves the trouble and take upon themselves the risk attending a struggle. The Parliament must, however, do something; and it is possible, that it may pursue the right course. God knows it has had enough said to it by me to make it see what that course is. In this state of uncertainty, my advice to every man is, get rid of your farm if you can, if you pay rent for it; and take no farm, even rent free, with the present taxes; and last of all, as long as you have labourers, let them be sufficiently paid for their labour; eat not your bread coming from the sweat of a starving brow.

There, BARING: that is my re-

commendation: and I have very great satisfaction in believing that it will have full as much weight as your's, and that of the two "*Squires*" and the five parsons. I am obliged to you, however, for issuing this declaration. In my letter to Mr. FAWKES, I observed that a *struggle* was at hand; that an attempt would be made to bring down the wages of the labourer to a bare sufficiency to sustain a sort of gradually perishing frame; to just enough to prevent actual dying at the end of a few weeks or months. I am glad that the declaration came forth, too, so soon after Mr. CANNING'S description of the "*comfort and affluence*" in which the labouring classes were living. The declaration came out *right early*. Time enough to make us look about us before the winter came on. I have, I trust, turned it to good account; and if I have not, it has not been for want of inclination.

WM. COBBETT.

THE CABINET.

—
From the "STATESMAN" of
Monday.

THE affairs of this quintessence of the *Collective Wisdom* appear to be settled, for the present, as far as relates to the filling up of the post of the hero of *North Cray*, who, we are now positively told by DANIEL STEWART, *Esquire*, of the *Courier* newspaper, and of *Eclair*-memory, is to be succeeded by the *Liverpool Operator*. This was announced to us in that paper of Saturday, in the following words, well worthy of public attention:

"Every thing was finally determined yesterday, and that Mr. CANNING has accepted the Seals of the Foreign Office. We believe, too, we can state that Mr. CANNING went to the India-house yesterday afternoon, upon the arrangements being completed, to communicate the fact personally to the Directors. We further understand, that a Privy Council will be held on Monday at Carlton Palace, for the purpose of swearing Mr. CANNING into Office. And now, while we congratulate the country, as we do most sincerely, upon the circumstance that it will continue to possess the benefit of Mr. CANNING's powerful talents, let us make one remark upon the evidence we here have, that the vulgar clamour against public men, as being wholly influenced by sordid motives of gain, is as false as it is vulgar. Mr. CANNING exchanges the com-

parative repose and the splendid income of the Governor-Generalship of India, for an office, at home, intensely laborious, and certainly not over, if it be not (as we think it is) under paid. He foregoes the opportunity of securing an ample fortune for his family, because he conscientiously feels it his duty, as a public man, to obey the call of those who deem his services essential, at the present moment, to the interest of the country. Malignity itself will not be brazen enough to insinuate in the face of these facts, that any but the purest and most honourable motives have actuated him in accepting the office of Foreign Secretary. *Ab uno disce omnes.*"

The object which STEWART has in view here, or, rather, the object which the masters of STEWART have in view, is to cause it to be believed, that it is a *sense of duty*; that it is *patriotism*; that is, *love of country*, that has made the Operator accept of this post, instead of that of *Governor-General*. In the first place, what do they mean by *accepting*? Did he not ask for it? Did he not beg and pray for it as barefacedly as ever mumper begged for a bit of bread? Did he not say, that as to "*Catholic Emancipation*," he would make a compromise? And did he not promise Borough-mongers, that he would continue to oppose Reform? "Well," says Stewart, but so much the better, then; for he begged for labour in exchange for repose, and for "*under-pay*" in exchange for a "*splendid for-*

tune." And this proves, that our accusations against "public men" are unjust; for, we accuse them, amongst other things, of being *wholly* influenced by "*sordid motives of gain*."—Stop a bit here, Daniel. We never do this. We never say, that money is their *only* object. We never dream of any such thing. We know well that *power* and *titles* make part of their objects. So that here is a falsehood.—But, now for the *labour, repose under-pay, and splendour*. What *labour* is there in the office of Foreign Affairs? The King assures us, twice a-year, that he continues to receive the strongest assurances of a *friendly disposition in all foreign powers*.—What is there to do, then, in that office? We know, well, that a *crazy fellow, a crack-brained fellow*, was at the head of it before; and yet it *went on vastly well!* The Governor-General may have little to do; but he must have little indeed, if he have so little as the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who has simply to record the accounts that he receives of the proof that England is now *laughed at all over the world*; and that the French and Americans are preparing to give her such a *souse* as shall make the "*Dead Weight*" dance a horn-pipe under her neck

where it hangs dangling.—And, as to the *pay*; as to the *money* part of the concern, who told DANIEL STEWART, that the Governor's post was the best? There are not such *very fine* things in India as there were *formerly*; and if there were, does Daniel recollect, that the Foreign Secretary has about a *hundred Consuls*, and *as many more Ambassadors and diplomatic people*, in his absolute appointment? Does not DANIEL know, that these are now made *births for life*? That, to be in one of those posts is to *qualify for a pension for life*? Can he discover any such things as these in the hands of the Governor-General? Did not CASTLEREAGH make a *good thing* of the Secretaryship? In short, as a *money concern*, this is by far the best.—Besides, though there are riches to be gotten in India, the Operator must have *gone to India to get them*. Ten pounds *down*, at Whitehall, are worth forty pounds *to be received* in India. To be *at sea for ten months* is no trifling matter. Indiamen sometimes *founder* and sometimes *go upon rocks*. Does not Mr. CANNING know this, think you?—But, this is all nonsense. We all know, that he must have looked on the post in India as a thing given to him to *get him out of the*

way; and accordingly we see how *eager he was to remain*; how quickly he availed himself of the lucky cut in the throat of CASTLEREAGH to beg, openly beg, to remain.—So much for the “*pure motives*” of the Liverpool Operator. As to the *Latin* of the Taylor’s Trotter, we agree to it; for it means, as to *purity*. CANNING is just as good as any of the rest.—As to DANIEL’S “*congratulating the country*” upon the event; why, we join him. We congratulate the country on it. We wanted to have the Operator remain *at home*, and we wanted to have him as *Minister in the House of Commons*. He has been a swaggering blade for thirty years; but, he never yet was the *responsible man*. He never yet was the *proposer of measures*. He is to be *that now*! It was sensibly observed by a gentleman the other day, that, until he saw CANNING bidding to stay at home, he always thought that he *understood the dangers to the concern*; but, that now, he was convinced that he *understood nothing at all about them*. We, for our parts, never believed, that he understood any thing at all of the matter. We always, ever since we have known him, regarded him as a most superficial man; a mere man of *froth*. And, if we

come to the proof, we find him a stickler for the *bullion propositions of Saint Horner*; we find him brawling with all his lungs for an *unanimous vote in favour of Peel’s Bill*; we find him saying that that Bill will *set the question at rest for ever*; we find him, during the last Session of Parliament, asserting, that *the people were opposed to that Bill*; and that this was a proof that it was *best* to have a Parliament that *did not speak the voice of the people*; and on his stage at Liverpool, we find him saying, that the *only remedy* for the distress of the farmers and landlords is *patience*. Here is the proof of his *shallowness*; of his *ignorance* of the state of the country’s affairs. What will he do? Does he think, that the landlords will suffer their estates to go clean away *quietly*? Does he think, that they are to be kept quiet without rents, by pretty prattle about Jacobins and Anti-Jacobins? Does he think, that his “*generalities*” will reconcile them to empty pockets? Does he not see, that the present race of farmers are melting away like fat before the sun? And does he hope, that he, by *sprightly talk*, shall be able to pacify the landlord, who sees his own complete ruin at hand? Will

he face *this*? Will he *push on*? Will he thrust the thing on till *after May next*, when the *Country Bankers must pay in gold*? Or, is he man enough to *face the GRIDIRON*? One of the two he *must face*! Let him remember that. And, happy shall we be to have *him* to face it. The other poor thing that cut his throat was not half so deeply committed as this one is. This is in the mess up to his very ears. He cannot get back; and there we shall see him, *stick fast*; and then we will set up a shout that shall be as sweet to his ears as was the late shout to the "*mourners*" at Westminster Abbey.—Then we will call out to him:—"Come, if 'thou art a man, now make a *stand against democratical encroachment*! Now make a *stand against the low, degraded crew*. Now tell us, that all the *squanderings are vested interests*. Now show us that *sun of prosperity*, which, seven years ago, you promised us *would speedily appear*!" If *sport* there ever were, sport we shall have, during the next winter. Last year was the very first time in our lives that we felt a desire to see the Parliament meet; but, our eagerness will be much greater this year. To triumph

over the crazy fellow that cut his throat would have been nothing. He was battered down to the earth as it was. But, now we have a cock that will shew us some play. We will ask him whether he do not think that *another Six-Acts* might help the concern? Whether another attempt to "*extinguish for ever the accursed torch of discord*" might not be likely to *get some rents for the landlords*? Whether he do not think that his old Editor, and brother sinecure placeman, WILLIAM GIFFORD, could, if he were called on, find out the means of getting rents paid, without any diminution of "*vested interests*?" Oh! what a sweet roar will be set up for him by STEWART and STODDART! The Parson-Justices are at work to *lower the wages of labour*! At Winchester they have resolved, that a labouring man shall not have *half so much as is paid to a common foot soldier*! Here will be a *struggle*! Here will be that "*comfort*," that "*plenty*," of which the Operator talked at Liverpool! Here will be *scenes*; and, the good of it will be, that the "*Jacobins*," have had nothing to do with the matter, and will have nothing to do with it. The *Jacobins* seeing what was coming, have taken care of

themselves : and will sit quietly looking on, while the "*respectable part of the Press*," and "His Majesty's *peaceable* and loyal subjects" settle the thing in their own good time and manner. To say, that the prospect gives us *pleasure* is faintly to describe what we feel. Nineteen years of obloquy deserves something more, in the way of compensation, than what is usually understood by *pleasure*. If any man be gifted with enough of imagination to tell what poor BYRNE and his wife and children felt, when they first heard of the affair of *The Bishop and the Soldier*, that man, and that man only, is able to say, what our feelings are at beholding the prospect that is now before us. We know precisely how the thing will *work*. It is not, in our heads, as it was in that of poor crazy CASTLEREAGH, "*a general working of events*:" we have a clear sight into the whole matter ; and have a great mind to write a *Companion to the Almanack*, and to give an account of the progress before the Parliament meet. But enough for the present. One word to the Operator ; just one word at his coming into office ; **THE GRIDIRON IS MADE !**

Wednesday.

Mr. CANNING is now regularly installed as a *Secretary of State*, and, *as such*, or as a Member of the Collective, we must not call him Mountebank Doctor and Jack Pudding and the like : it is only when he occasionally appears on his stage at Liverpool, and St. Patrick's Dinner, and such like places, that we can *make really free* with him. Whatever jests he may think proper to utter, either by pen or tongue, in these his *sacred* capacities, and especially in the latter, we must treat with a *light hand* ; and, we are of opinion, that he never will again give us an opportunity to meet him on the stage at Liverpool. We must now preserve our *gravity*, when we have his productions under our eye ; or, at least, as much gravity as we can muster up. He will not leave room, we think, for us to laugh at his *grammar* ; for, as far as that goes, he is a *learned man*. We shall, we dare say, never, while he is a Minister, have to crack our jokes on the *language* of King's Speeches ; unless, indeed, *jest*s should break out ; and, that is not very likely in these serious times. In the West of England, the girls, when the fellows are

rather forward, do not cry out, "*paws off*;" but, "*be sober*;" which is nearly the same as the remonstrance of the French girls, who, in such emergencies, say, "*soyez sage*," that is to say, "*be wise*," or *serious*, or *sober*. We would beg permission to offer Mr. CANNING (for we must call him *Mr.* when he is off his stage) this same piece of advice, *soyez sage*, Monsieur. Do not run riot with the *landlords*, who are, just at this moment, in no temper to receive sarcastic jests. They will be perfectly *sober*; and, their ill-humour must not be made a subject of laughter by any one who lives on those taxes, which take away their rents. In order that Mr. CANNING may *know a little something* of the extent to which must be carried that "*patience*," which he has recently recommended so strongly to the landlords and farmers; and, in order to give him a correct notion of that "*comfort and affluence*," in which he said the labouring classes were now living; we sent him, yesterday, to his house at Brompton, called Gloucester Lodge, a *Norfolk* and also a *Hampshire* newspaper, accompanied with a note from ourselves, a copy of which note will be found in the next *Register*. The Nor-

folk paper would shew him, that the farming stock of *one hundred and fifteen farms*, in that county, is *advertised for public sale*; and, the Hampshire paper would show him, that a Bench of Justices, consisting of Sir THOMAS BARING, two "*Squires*," and *five parsons*, had recommended *3s. a-week in winter*, and *4s. a-week in summer*, as the wages of a labouring man! We really believe, that he was wholly ignorant of the state of the country; and we wrote to him, with the above-mentioned enclosures, with the view of letting him see, with his own eyes, a little of what that situation is; and to prepare him for a grand sweep, on the part of the landlords, at those "*vested interests*," of which he was pleased to talk during the last Session of Parliament. There are rumours of Mr. HUSKISSON taking the place of the present CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER. We do not believe this. There are many reasons for our not believing it.—But, *what will Mr. Huskisson do!* Can he, after his speech of 1815, pretend, that *rents can be paid* with wheat at 4s. a bushel? That speech must be printed again before Parliament meet. He must be asked to reconcile it with his present notions about the capability of things to come about.

He must acknowledge that he was *in error* in 1815, or that his present doctrines *are false*. He has a choice, to be sure; but one of the two he must take. Mr. HUSKISSON's conduct puzzles us more than that of any other man.—For, *he* has sense; he has experience; he has evidently thought a great deal on the subject. We know, that attachment to place and emolument is very strong, and we have seen nothing to make us suppose, that it is not as strong with him as with others. But he *must* see (unless his mind be wholly changed as to its faculty of reasoning,) that this system must, and that too, before long, be wholly changed; or, that there must be something very little short of a general convulsion. In the *Norwich Gazette* and the *Norwich Mercury*, there are a hundred and seventy-five advertisements for the *public sale of farming stock*! In about forty of these the owners announce that they are *quitting business*; in a considerable number the sales are expressed to take place *under executions*, or assignments: and in the other cases, we are left to conclude, that the parties are leaving off farming. Only think of a hundred and seventy odd farms thus *actually broken up* in

this one county. In all probability, these farms contain not much less than *fifty thousand acres of land*; and we would beg Mr. HUSKISSON to observe, that this is not that *poor land*, of which Mr. RICARDO speaks, as being necessary to be thrown out of cultivation. If a hundred and seventy farms be actually broken up, what must be the situation of the other farms of the county? We are at our wits end to account for the conduct of Mr. HUSKISSON. He has more sense than any of the rest; and can he imagine that this thing can go on in the present way without producing a convulsion? We repeat, that his speech of 1815 must be republished before the Parliament meet. His present opinions are in direct opposition to ours. Ours were what they had been from the year 1803 to the year 1815; and what they have been from 1815 to the present hour. The people of Havant burnt him in effigy in 1815. We defended him. We said that he was right. But we cannot say that he is right now; for, in 1815, he said that the present taxes would not be paid, unless wheat were at *double the price that it was during the war*; and now he says that the present taxes can be paid with wheat at the

same price that it was at before the war!—He will have to retract. One of the two of these opinions he must give up; and would it not be better for him, manfully to give up, than to endeavour by a train of subterfuges to support a pretended consistency, and to drag along another year or two of his life, basted incessantly as he will be by us?—We really do believe; shameful as it is to him: we really do believe, that he is restrained from acting this manly part, partly, if not principally, because his surrendering would be a *surrendering to us!* This false pride is of all things in the world the most foolish; and it scarcely ever fails to add to the quantity of mortification that the party has to experience. During the American war, the world had to witness numerous instances of this silly pride on the part of the English Government and its commanders; but the most remarkable instance of it was, perhaps, exhibited by CORNWALLIS when he was taken, with his army, at Little York in Virginia. The capturing army consisted of Americans under the command of WASHINGTON, and of French under the command of ROCHAMBEAU. When it came to the ceremony of CORNWALLIS'S

surrendering his sword, he expressed his wish to surrender it to ROCHAMBEAU, and *not to WASHINGTON!* The weakness, the miserableness, of this request was to be surpassed by nothing but the gentle, the polite, and the dignified manner in which it was refused by the American General, who, without a word that could discover any angry feeling, without a word from which you could gather that he perceived the false pride of CORNWALLIS, put the whole upon the customs of war and his duty towards his country. —This might serve as a warning to Mr. HUSKISSON and his colleagues: surrender they must, or tear the country to pieces; and in spite of all their endeavours to disguise it, the nation will say, that they surrender to the Author of the Register. If it be said, that we ought to imitate the gentleness, the politeness and dignity of Washington, we observe, that the enemy has *not yet* signified his intention to surrender. When Mr. Huskisson shall be brought to that point, he shall see how *gentle and polite* we can be! One would almost think that he would hasten to surrender, were it only from curiosity to see how we should look, when in a gentle mood.

MARKETS.

Average Price of CORN throughout ENGLAND, from the last Gazette.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.
Wheat.....	38	8
Rye.....	19	8
Barley.....	21	2
Oats.....	17	8
Beans.....	23	2
Pease.....	24	3

At MARK LANE (last Monday).

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.
Wheat.....	40	0
Barley.....	20	6
Oats.....	19	7
Rye.....	0	0
Beans.....	23	3
Pease.....	26	8

SMITHFIELD (last Market).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	2	8	to	3 4
Mutton.....	2	6	—	2 10
Veal.....	3	6	—	4 6
Pork.....	3	0	—	3 8

NEWGATE (last Market).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	2	0	to	2 8
Mutton.....	1	10	—	2 6
Veal.....	2	8	—	4 0
Pork.....	2	4	—	3 8
Lamb.....	2	8	—	3 4

BACON—Is considerably more in demand than last week, in consequence of the fineness of the weather. And the same cause operating against the making up of New in Ireland, the trade seem to give up the idea of a further decline. Best 32s. Middling and heavy 25s. to 28s.

BUTTER—Continues steady at nearly the same prices as for two or three weeks past; and much depends upon the weather, as to the course likely to be pursued by the larger Dealers, who usually invest pretty considerably at this time of the year; especially when there is a probability of cold weather. Carlow, 80s. to 82s.—Waterford, 73s. to 75s.—Belfast, 80s.—Limerick, 72s.—Dutch, 82s.

CHEESE—Begins to accumulate in considerable quantities; but there is an unusual disproportion in the value; the finest kinds bringing very high prices, whilst the inferior kinds are almost unsaleable. After the ensuing Reading Fair, it is expected there will be a considerable fall in price. Fine Cheshire, 74s. to 76s.; inferior, 60s. to 70s.—Old Derby, (coloured) 52s. to 56s.; New, 46s. to 48s.; Pale, 43s. to 45s.—New Double Gloucester, 46s. to 50s.; Single, (the best) 44s. to 46s.; (middling) 36s. to 42s.